

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 94 04:30:13 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #79
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 22 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 79

Today's Topics:

 Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
 Exams are Trivial?

Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses) (5 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 94 20:28:59 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Dan Pickersgill - USENET POSTS
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

...green spleen... <trd54583@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu> writes:

> xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:
>
> >Obviously, you've confused me with someone else. Only the lazy and
> >shiftless whine about how much of a raw deal they've been dealt.
> >Since I have earned my Extra class ticket, there's no need for
> >me to whine. Can Dan say the same?
>
> Your earning your Extra class has absolutely nothing to do with your whining
> in this group. I see you whining all the time about other posters and about
> other hams' habits that you find annoying. I geuss the definition of
> whining is in the eye of the beholder...
>
> Anyway, I've heard only informed and well thought out reasons why the code

```
> test should be reduced in importance or dropped altogether. Whining is
> something I have not heard.
>
```

Yes, Robert, EXCUSE me, 'A great x ray technician!', will spend time
 ^^^^^^^^^^^
 questioning your parenting, but he would never resort to anything as
 mundane as FACTS to add to the debate. Lies work so much better.

(Humm, sounds like Liberals and HCI... interesting...)

Dan

— —

Samuel Adams: "The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 1994 13:32:12 GMT
From: brunix!pstc3!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Exams are Trivial?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <kNo3Hc1w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

|> But Jeff, there are many reasons for Amateur Radio to exist besides the
|> tech portion (aside from the fact that that area interests me greatly).
|> Why do you diminish the value of those areas of the Service?

The hobby is a technical one. There are several other reasons why the amateur service exists, as is codified by Part 97, but they all hinge upon operators being technically adept at the art of radio communication. Eliminate the technical aspect of the hobby, and you get CB radio.

A sad commentary on amateur radio is easily demonstrated from the following advertisement in Popular Communications. You can now purchase a T-Shirt for the "QCAO" - Quarter Century Appliance Operators. The t-shirt has a on/off switch in the center, with the motto "don't ask me how it works!"

MD

— —

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 94 19:59:59 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:
>
> : I will concede that written English is a form of the English language.
> : And by extrapolation morse is a form of english just as ASCII is.
>
> I guess my problem with ASCII is that it is never presented to your
> senses for automatic decoding, but morse and speech and writing all
> are. No one "understands" ASCII, and no one "reads" it. So it lacks
> that attribute of "language." I suppose low-speed morse isn't
> presented to your senses for automatic decoding, since you write it
> down character by character. But high-speed morse you just
> "understand" seems different, the same way reading is different from
> learning to read.

I read EBCDIC just fine. I have never really had to read ASCII a lot but
probably could if the need arose. Since there are a lot of people out
there that can read EBCDIC, then it is, by your definition a 'language'?

> : However morse, by itself is an encryption method for the english (or
> : roman if you prefer) alphabet, independent of language. As is ASCII and
> : others. Therefore, being independent of language, it is NOT a language
> : by itself, but an encryption method. Is the Roman alphabet a language,
> : by itself, without any of the languages that borrow the characters? For
> : if morse is a language, by your definition, so is the roman alphabet,
> : ASCII and many other forms of encryption.

>

> Ok, so:

>

> The alphabet, the morse characters, mouth sounds, and the ASCII table
> are not language; rather, language is expressed using them.

Correct. 'Grej s ahf dasg fl au is gip jfwe anhgadkh.' Is not
'language'?

> Morse, speech, and writing are more like language than ASCII, because
> (when fluent) they are presented to human senses for a sort of
> effortless, automatic decoding, even though almost all of the
> information that can be carried by writing can be carried by ASCII
> just as well or better, depending on the application, and that can be
> considered "language."

And you could become just as fluent with ASCII. It is just that there is not that big of a demand to do in wetware what computers and other similar equipment can do better, faster and with less error.

Again I and others can read EBCDIC, is that now a new 'language'?

> Morse is less like language than speech or writing because of a very
> limited independent grammar that's good enough for a QSO but has to
> revert to the grammar of a full-fledged language like English to
> discuss, say, the morse code requirement. It's not *a* language, but
> it could be considered a very *limited* language, or a limited *form*
> of language, or something.

You can 'consider' it a language all you want. But alone, by itself, it is NOT a language. It may well be a 'form' of English. I can NOT be a 'language' as some on the net argue. And it is certainly not sentent as some seem to believe.

> Speech and writing are full-fledged language, but, unlike English
> or French, are not languages themselves.

Again, maybe to describe them as a form of english. But I still argue that there is no substantitive difference between Morse encryption and EBCDIC encryption.

> Or so it seems to me.

>

Or so it seems to me.

(ECHO echo)

73 David,

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Dan Pickersgill | N8PKV | | Pots have handles, | | 'Climage is what we |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org | | | Magazines have personals, | | expect, weather is |
| ac447@po.cwru.edu | | | Hams have names. | | what we get.' -L. Long |

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 94 20:14:38 EST

From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> Okay, lets break this down. English is a language, as are French, German,
> Italian, etc. They have grammar, syntax, objects and verbs, modifiers,
> a sense of context and meaning. The Roman alphabet can be used to encode
> these spoken languages into written form via positionally encoded arrangement
> called "spelling" (something often sadly lacking on the net). Morse in
> turn is an encoding of the Roman alphabet that facilitates it's transmission
> over limited bandwidth wire or wireless links. It is not encryption since
> encryption's purpose is to *obscure* meaning while encoding can be used
> to facilitate transmission. In this respect, Morse is no different than
> ASCII or Baudot encoding. It is not *language*.
>
> (Now encryption may be the proper term when discussing Morse *testing*,
> since that hazing process is intended to limit access to spectrum through
> use of arbitrary obstacles to success in obtaining a license.)

Gary, I appologize. You are correct a more appropiate term would be encoding.

> Now this is to the point as well. If Morse were language, there would
> be no need to ask this question. The extra layer of indirection required
> to convey meaning shows that Morse is not language. It is QSO English
> or QSO French that's the pidgin language being transmitted, not Morse
> "language".

Thank you for stating it better than I did.

> >: > But, haven't we really gotten off the point - that all these forms of
> >: > language are conditioned responses, and that memorization is needed
> >: > for all of them, but that doesn't necessarily make them contemptible?
> >: > Dan heaped contempt on all mere conditioned responses - compared
> >: > developing them to surrendering one's humanity (by becoming dogs,
> >: > presumably). But I can't figure out how he typed his post in without
> >: > using a number of them.
> >: > -drt
> >: Dan did what? Humm... More like;
> >: Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote (replying to Ed Hare):
> >
> >: >Ed, the only thing I would take exception to (and you mentioned it) is
> >: >that morse is an encryption method not a language. And it IS memorized
> >: >the fact that you have limited time to respond is a conditioned response
> >: >again, not learned. Conditioned. Any one remember Dr. Pavlov?
> >

> >: I didn't realize that the above was heaping contempt on conditioned
> >: responses.
> >
> >Sure. The Pavlov crack gives the game away. The mental image of
> >people learning code is subserviant salivating dogs, and it's a pretty
> >clear image. You really didn't find that contemptuous, especially
> >given the tone of this and your other posts on the topic? Even on
> >second reading?
>
> It doesn't look like a crack to me. It's certainly true that rote,
> repetitive conditioning is required to gain "fluency" in Morse
> decoding. That process is hastened by use of immediate feedback
> systems of reward and punishment (thus the success of Supermorse
> and it's ilk, and *on air contacts*). This sort of conditioning
> system is patterned after the work of Pavlov and Skinner. Pavlov
> showed that the subject need not even be conscious of the process
> for it to succeed. That seems clearly to be the case with many of
> the pro-coders since they are obviously confused as to the nature
> of what they have been conditioned to do in gaining Morse proficiency.

Dan

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Dan Pickersgill | N8PKV | | Pots have handles, | | 'Climage is what we |
| dan@mystis.wariat.org | | | Magazines have personals, | | expect, weather is |
| ac447@po.cwru.edu | | | Hams have names. | | what we get.' -L. Long |

Date: Mon, 21 Feb 1994 13:32:52 GMT
From: world!drt@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:

: I will conced that written English is a form of the English language.
: And by extrapolation morse is a form of english just as ASCII is.

I guess my problem with ASCII is that it is never presented to your
senses for automatic decoding, but morse and speech and writing all
are. No one "understands" ASCII, and no one "reads" it. So it lacks
that attribute of "language." I suppose low-speed morse isn't
presented to your senses for automatic decoding, since you write it
down character by character. But high-speed morse you just
"understand" seems different, the same way reading is different from
learning to read.

: However morse, by itself is an encryption method for the english (or
: roman if you prefer) alaphabet, indepentant of language. As is ASCII and
: others. Therefore, being indepentant of language, it is NOT a language
: by itself, but an encryption method. Is the Roman alaphabet a language,
: by itself, without any of the languages that borrow the characters? For
: if morse is a language, by your definition, so is the roman alaphabet,
: ASCII and many other forms of encryption.

Ok, so:

The alphabet, the morse characters, mouth sounds, and the ASCII table
are not language; rather, language is expressed using them.

Morse, speech, and writing are more like language than ASCII, because
(when fluent) they are presented to human senses for a sort of
effortless, automatic decoding, even though almost all of the
information that can be carried by writing can be carried by ASCII
just as well or better, depending on the application, and that can be
considered "language."

Morse is less like language than speech or writing because of a very
limited independent grammar that's good enough for a QSO but has to
revert to the grammar of a full-fledged language like English to
discuss, say, the morse code requirement. It's not *a* language, but
it could be considered a very *limited* language, or a limited *form*
of language, or something.

Speech and writing are full-fledged language, but, unlike English
or French, are not languages themselves.

Or so it seems to me.

-drt

|David R. Tucker KG2S drt@world.std.com|

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 94 00:56:10 EST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> Richard L Barnaby (barnaby@world.std.com) wrote:
> : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:
>
> : >Ah, I see one of my favorite topics is back. :-)
>
> : [snip
>
> : Seems to me that I've seen a lot of reference on this topic to
> : "Morse". Like "Is Morse a language?" It's as if "Morse Code" has been
> : abbreviated to "Morse" for the net's usage. (Sometimes even referred to
> : as "Morris", but let's not start *that* up again). I'll agree with
> : Gary that "Morse" is *not* a language, but it would seem that by looking
> : closely at "Morse code" we would realize that it just might be
> : "a code!".
> : -Barnaby barnaby@world.std.com (AA1IB)
>
> I know that. It's just an abbreviation, that's all.

Wait a minute, hold the phone (key, bug, keyer...);

What happened to "I don't understand why you can't accept the statement that Morse is a language in one sense (written vs. spoken) [at least at higher speeds]..."?

Dan

--

Samuel Adams: "The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms." During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 94 00:43:14 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Morse Code testing (was Re: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

> The key phrase is "In this respect," as in, "It is not language" *in
> this respect*. That does not mean it is not "language" in a less
> exacting sense of the term, a sense in common use.
>
> After explaining how Morse is like a language in some respects, and
> not a language in other respects, and that whether it's a "language"
> and to what extent it is depends more on your terminology, and after

> showing that my terminology was not arbitrary but was used in other
> fields, I can't understand why you went back to the beginning as if I
> had written nothing. We went through that breakdown before, and found
> that with that narrow terminology we couldn't explain why the "spoken
> language" could be said to differ from the "written language," when
> the two do, in fact, have slightly different grammars. It's an
> oversimplification to insist that only the one, narrow sense of the
> term is proper. We've been over this.
>
> I don't understand why you can't accept the statement that Morse is a
> language in one sense (written vs. spoken) [at least at higher
> speeds], but not in another sense (English vs. French), except perhaps
> in a very limited way with respect to internationally understood
> Q-codes and prosigns and such. It's not like ASCII. I've never seen
> or heard ASCII, and sure wouldn't understand it if I did. I see
> letters on a screen, or whatever. Morse, I understand. Speech, I
> understand. Writing, I understand. No one understands text in ASCII.
> So Morse, in *this* respect, *is* different from ASCII, but not speech
> or writing. The brain decodes Morse? That's no point scored: the
> brain decodes speech and writing, too.
>
> Your terminology, while valid, is not the only useful, accurate one,
> especially since the other terminology has been sighted outside of
> this newsgroup (meaning, I didn't make it up arbitrarily). If you
> hear someone say, "Morse code is an international language," you can't
> berate him until you find out what he means by that, and that he means
> the same thing you do. Otherwise a flame war results, because though
> you'll both be using English, you won't be speaking the same language
> (so to speak :-)) - you haven't come to terms - and you'll never figure
> it out. Everyone walks away convinced that the other side is
> incredibly dense - even if *no one* is really "wrong."
>
> I guess that's about it for this thread, since I don't see what else I
> can do to make my point clear. Mere repetition is guaranteed to fail.
> We really must allow an author to choose the terms, if we want to
> understand what's said.
>
> -drt

David, you restate your argument with little to no support then claim
the discussion over. Now one last challenge.

Let's boil this down to one, simple question. Can you communicate with
someone, in morse CODE, without using 'ANOTHER' language. If yes, it is a
language. If no, it is a code for the language being sent.

Can you say 'Hello, my name is David'?!?!?

In morse for us WITHOUT using english or another language, just moris.

Since Gary is an advance or extra (given his call) and I run a MCW practice net, I think we BOTH will understand it if you manage.

David, morse may 'seem like a language', that does not MAKE it a language. And it not being a language does not address the test/no-test debate, the amount of enjoyment you get out of it or its usefulness in amateur radio (nor its usefullness in the rest of radio).

Dan

--

Samuel Adams:"The Constitution shall never be construed to prevent people of the United States who are peaceable citizens from keeping their own arms."
During Massachusetts' U.S. Constitution ratification convention, (1788)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #79
